



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,221	04/26/2001	Paul Kostenuik	A-665B	8369

21069 7590 05/05/2003
AMGEN INCORPORATED
MAIL STOP 27-4-A
ONE AMGEN CENTER DRIVE
THOUSAND OAKS, CA 91320-1799

EXAMINER

NICHOLS, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/843,221

Applicant(s)

KOSTENUIK ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher Nichols, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 40-79 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 9 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1647

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-39) drawn to compositions of matter comprising SEQ ID NO: 16 in Paper No. 11 (18 October 2002) is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that search of all claimed inhibitors would not present a burden on the Examiner. This is not found persuasive because each permutation coinciding with a particular SEQ ID NO corresponds to a distinct and independent sequence, each of which is non-obvious over the other. Thus each SEQ ID NO requires a separate and non-overlapping search thus presenting an undue search burden on the Examiner. Claim 39 does not recite SEQ ID NO: 16 or other is not otherwise drawn to SEQ ID NO: 16, therefore it does not recite the invention. Thus claim 39 is withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 40-79 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims

2. The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1647, Examiner Christopher Nichols.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: Figure 1D, 1E, and 1F. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to because Figure 7 includes several categories on the X-axis which are neither listed nor explained in the specification. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to because Figure 10 includes three separate components which are neither listed nor explained in the specification (i.e. listed and explained as "10A, 10B, 10C"). In addition, the categories on the X-axis of the top two figures are not labeled in Figure 10. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to because Figure 11 includes four separate components which are neither listed nor explained in the specification (i.e. listed and explained as "11A, 11B, 11C, 11D"). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

8. Claims 1-38 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims recite non-elected species. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are drawn to "a composition of matter" which may be a product of nature. The amendment of the claims to read "An isolated polypeptide comprising SEQ ID NO: 16..." or "A substantially pure composition of matter comprising SEQ ID NO: 16..." would obviate this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims **31, 36, and 38** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 31 refers to Table 1, claim 36 refers to Table 2, and claim 38 refers to Table 4. Thus the claims are not complete. The recitation of tables and figures thus renders the claims indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims **1-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5393869 (28 February 1995) Nakagawa et al. US 5393869 discloses SEQ ID NO: 1, a 34 residue long peptide which shares 100% homology to SEQ ID NO: 16 of the instant application (Col. 1-2).

12. Although the SEQ ID NO's are not manufactured or disclosed as being from the same source, it has been established by the courts that a product inherently possesses characteristics of that product (i.e. including the amino acid sequence of a protein). See, e.g., *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430). In addition,

“the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Accordingly, since the issue in the present appeal is whether the prior art factor is identified or patently indistinct from that of the material on appeal, appellants have the burden of showing that inherency is not involved”. *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (1989); *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1976).

Art Unit: 1647

Moreover, when the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Lastly it is noted that the courts have held that when the prior art product reasonable appears to be the same as that claimed, but differs by process in which it is produced, a rejection of this nature is eminently fair and the burden is upon the appellants to prove, by comparative evidence, a patentable difference (*In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685).

Therefore US 5393869 meets all the limitations of claims 1-38 and anticipates claims 1-38.

13. Claims **1-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5556940 (17 September 1996) Willick et al. US 5556940 discloses SEQ ID NO: 1, a 34 residue long peptide which shares 100% homology to SEQ ID NO: 16 of the instant application (Col. 7-8).

14. Although the SEQ ID NO's are not manufactured or disclosed as being from the same source, it has been established by the courts that a product inherently possesses characteristics of that product (i.e. including the amino acid sequence of a protein). See, e.g., *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430). In addition,

“the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Accordingly, since the issue in the present appeal is whether the prior art factor is identified or patently indistinct from that of the material on appeal, appellants have the burden of showing that inherency is not involved”. *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (1989); *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1976).

Moreover, when the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ

Art Unit: 1647

289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Lastly it is noted that the courts have held that when the prior art product reasonable appears to be the same as that claimed, but differs by process in which it is produced, a rejection of this nature is eminently fair and the burden is upon the appellants to prove, by comparative evidence, a patentable difference (*In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685).

Therefore US 5556940 meets all the limitations of claims 1-38 and anticipates claims 1-38.

15. Claims **1-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5589452 (31 December 1996) Krstenansky et al. US 5589452 discloses SEQ ID NO: 1, a 34 residue long peptide which shares 100% homology to SEQ ID NO: 16 of the instant application (Col. 25-26).

16. Although the SEQ ID NO's are not manufactured or disclosed as being from the same source, it has been established by the courts that a product inherently possesses characteristics of that product (i.e. including the amino acid sequence of a protein). See, e.g., *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430). In addition,

“the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Accordingly, since the issue in the present appeal is whether the prior art factor is identified or patently indistinct from that of the material on appeal, appellants have the burden of showing that inherency is not involved”. *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (1989); *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1976).

Moreover, when the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a

product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*., 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Lastly it is noted that the courts have held that when the prior art product reasonable appears to be the same as that claimed, but differs by process in which it is produced, a rejection of this nature is eminently fair and the burden is upon the appellants to

Art Unit: 1647

prove, by comparative evidence, a patentable difference (*In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685).

Therefore US 5589452 meets all the limitations of claims 1-38 and anticipates claims 1-38.

17. Claims **1-38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5693616 (2 December 1997) Krstenansky et al. US 5693616 discloses SEQ ID NO: 1, a 34 residue long peptide which shares 100% homology to SEQ ID NO: 16 of the instant application (Col. 25-26).

18. Although the SEQ ID NO's are not manufactured or disclosed as being from the same source, it has been established by the courts that a product inherently possesses characteristics of that product (i.e. including the amino acid sequence of a protein). See, e.g., *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d; *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430). In addition,

“the PTO can require an applicant to prove that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the characteristics of his claimed product. Accordingly, since the issue in the present appeal is whether the prior art factor is identified or patently indistinct from that of the material on appeal, appellants have the burden of showing that inherency is not involved”. *Ex parte Gray*, 10 USPQ 2d 1922 (1989); *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1976).

Moreover, when the product in a product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior art product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*., 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292-293 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Lastly it is noted that the courts have held that when the prior art product reasonable appears to be the same as that claimed, but differs by process in which it is produced, a rejection of this nature is eminently fair and the burden is upon the appellants to prove, by comparative evidence, a patentable difference. (*In re Brown*, 173 USPQ 685).

Therefore US 5693616 meets all the limitations of claims 1-38 and anticipates claims 1-38.

Summary

19. Claims 1-38 are hereby rejected.

Art Unit: 1647

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Christopher James Nichols, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is 703-305-3955. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Gary Kunz, Ph.D.** can be reached on 703-308-4623. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9307 for After Final communications. The fax phone numbers for the customer service center is 703-872-9305

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.

CJN
April 17, 2003

Elizabeth C. Kemmerer

ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
